

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 9, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application.

For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended the specification to provide updated related application information, as requested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by the amendment.

Cited Art Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

The present invention ensures accurate font matching in exchanged documents. As recited in independent claims 1, 9, and 15, the present invention includes forming a database of font specifications. The present invention also includes accessing the database when saving and opening documents to ensure usage of proper fonts. In this manner, efficient storage of the font specifications for unique association with each font in a database is provided. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art of Nielsen fails to teach, show, or suggest the recited invention.

In the cited art of Nielsen, Nielsen maintains a database of font size changes made by a user to particular documents to infer a font size preference for a document. (See the Abstract) Nielsen records font size changes for changes made via a browser/user interface to a font size for

a web page being viewed. The saved font size data is utilized "the next time that page is accessed." (Col. 2, lines 12-13). While the Examiner contends that the saving of font size change data in a database anticipates the recited invention, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The independent claims recite that the database of font specifications is accessed when opening and saving documents. It appears that the Examiner believes that the recording of font size for the URL in the database of Nielsen anticipates the recited accessing of the database of font specifications when saving documents (see paragraph 1 of page 3 of the above-identified Office Action). However, this position does not demonstrate any teaching or suggestion of actions that occur with the database when a *document* is saved, but rather, only indicates actions that occur when recording font sizes. Applicant fails to see how the recording of font sizes in a database teach or suggest actions occurring when saving a document. In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that Nielsen is silent regarding the saving of the documents being viewed, and merely discusses the use of the database for documents being accessed/retrieved over the network interface. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Nielsen fails to teach, show, or suggest the recited invention that includes accessing a database of font specifications when saving and opening documents to ensure usage of proper fonts.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Nielsen deals strictly with a database of font sizes. In contrast, as described on page 5, lines 1-5, of the present application, the font specifications being saved in the present invention are created to uniquely identify each font used in a document by calculating a plurality of attributes for a font. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 15 to more particularly recite the aspect that the recited font specifications include at least two attributes of a font. Applicant respectfully submits that in

addition to the aforementioned deficiencies of Nielsen, Nielsen wholly fails to teach, show, or suggest a database of font specifications that include at least two attributes of a font.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 9, and 15 are allowable over the cited art. Applicant also respectfully submits that claims 2-8, 10-14, and 16-20, as the respective direct or indirect dependent claims of claims 1, 9, and 15, include the features of one of the independent claims while adding further features. Accordingly, these claims are respectfully submitted as allowable over the cited art for at least those reasons associated with claims 1, 9, and 15, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

May 10, 2004
Date


Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,875
(650) 493-4540